

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
19 February 1969
INDEX

ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meetings
2. Approval of Minutes of January 1969 Meeting

SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

1. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
 - a. Proposed Waterfront Development, Maine Avenue, S.W. 1
 - b. L'Enfant Plaza, East Building - Proposed Design 2
 - c. Southwest Pepco Substation, E and Third Streets, S.W. 2
 - d. Fort Lincoln Development 2
2. I. M. Pei and Associates
 - Robert Kennedy Grave Site, Arlington, Va. 3
4. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections
 - a. Shipstead-Luce Act
 - (1.) S.L. 69-35, 1401 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. 4
 - (2.) S.L. 69-38, 515 20th Street, N.W. 4
 - (3.) S.L. 69-36, 801 17th Street, N.W. 4
 - (4.) Appendix 1 4
 - b. Old Georgetown Act
 - (1.) O.G. 69-85, Application for razing frame dwelling at 2505 P Street, N.W. 4
 - (2.) Appendix 2 5

5. National Institutes of Health

Incinerator, Tri-Service, Forest Glen Station,
Walter Reed Army Medical Center 5

LEGISLATION

1. H.R. 440-1/3/69-Mr. Eilberg-91st Congress 5
2. Draft Legislation - Bureau of the Budget -
91st Congress 5

INTERVIEWS

1. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
Proposed Waterfront Development 5-6
2. Freer Gallery of Art
Inspections of Proposed Acquisitions 6
3. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
 - a. L'Enfant Plaza, East Building 6
 - b. Southwest Pepco Substation 7
 - c. Fort Lincoln Development 7
4. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses
and Inspections
 - a. S.L. 69-38, 515 20th Street, N.W. 7
 - b. S.L. 69-36, 801 17th Street, N.W. 7
5. National Institutes of Health
Incinerator, Walter Reed Army Medical Center 7

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

A regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on 19 February 1969. The members met, pursuant to notice, in executive session at 10:20 a.m. with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Kevin Roche
Chloethiel Woodard Smith
John Walker

Staff: Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Marion L. Luskey
Myra Younker
NCPC: David McKinnon
Recorder: Leone Vialpando

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting: Executive and Open Sessions - 19 March, 10:00 a.m.

The members approved Wednesday, the 19th of March, for the date of the next meeting.

2. Approval of Minutes of January 1969 Meeting.

The minutes will be circulated to the members for review.

III. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

The Secretary reviewed the following projects.

1. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

a. Proposed Waterfront Development - Maine Avenue, S.W. A model of a plan developed by the RLA staff was submitted.

The submission at the January 1969 meeting reflected the original plan for the Waterfront designed by Sasaki, Dawson and Demay, landscape architects and approved by the Commission. But the members recommended that an overall architectural development plan be made to serve as a guide by which RLA could control the designs for the area hopefully resulting in some degree of unity for the entire area.

Final action was withheld until a conference with representatives of RLA later.

b. L'Enfant Plaza, East Building - Proposed Design. Vlastimil Koubek, architect.

Drawings indicated an office/hotel building which would span Ninth Street at the east end of L'Enfant Plaza. The members briefly discussed the plan noting some discrepancies between drawings and model. The site is the last to be developed in the L'Enfant Plaza and considered most important in relation to the adjacent Dept. of Housing and Urban Development headquarters immediately to the east.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect later.

c. Southwest Pepco Substation, E and Third Streets, S.W. - Proposed Design, Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon, architects. A study model, location plan, perspective and site photograph were submitted.

The design for the substation to be located south of the railroad tracks consisted of two elements - an enclosed switching equipment section and an open transformer section. According to the Secretary, the architect wanted "to get a sense of direction from the Commission about the appropriateness of the idea."

The members recommended that a closed, unified, design should be considered and the structure lowered either by going farther into the ground or spreading it over more of the site or a combination of the two.

A conference with the architect scheduled for later was considered unnecessary and cancelled.

The Commission's recommendation was forwarded to the Redevelopment Land Agency.

~~EXHIBIT A~~

D. Fort Lincoln Development, Bladensburg Road and Eastern Avenue, N.E. - Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon, architects, with Voornes and Associates, Inc., Gladstone and Associates, and Volkert and Associates as transportation, economic and engineering consultants. Two models and several drawings were submitted.

Formerly the site of the National Training School, the Fort Lincoln Development will have a mixture of residential, commercial and educational facilities. The Federal City College complex would be over the Baltimore Washington Parkway. Internal circulation included an elevated transportation system. Three architects originally commissioned to design the housing units were Harry Weese, Paul Rudolph and Moshe Safdie. The plan by Mr. Weese was in progress while Mr. Rudolph's was still in the experimental stage. Mr. Safdie's was considered too expensive.

Discussion of the project was withheld until a conference with the architectural consultants later.

2. I.M. Pei and Associates

Robert Kennedy Grave Site, Arlington, Va. - Revised Design,
Plans and Sectional Drawings were submitted.

The size of the plan had been reduced and the axis of the platform and pool slightly turned from the axis of the Lee Mansion and Lincoln Memorial. These revisions were suggestions made during the January 1969 meeting.

The members discussed the program and design in relation to the President's grave. The plan to create a design which would be a separate experience for the viewer from that received at the President's was considered the main problem. This might be solved, the members thought, by changing the program which should be discussed with officials of the Department of Defense and the Cemetery.

Mr. Jordan, counsel in the office of the Secretary of the Army, and Mr. Metzler, superintendent of the Cemetery, attended the meeting.

Mr. Walton presented the problem and expressed the Commission's reservations about the design, which should be "totally redesigned." He asked Mr. Bunshaft to express the members' views.

He spoke of the family's requirement for a separate design from the President's and one which "had a sense of the outdoors, water, trees." The Department of the Army's requirement for a paved area where crowds could pause was mentioned. He explained the members' idea of creating a wooded area with a pool which could be reached by an informal path from the President's grave. This would eliminate the large paved area for crowds but the path could be widened along the grave. The secluded plan would contrast with the open design of the President's grave. Neither one would diminish the other.

Apparently this plan was favored by the Counsel and the Superintendent who had reviewed the history of the project pertaining to their requirements. As far as could be ascertained no alternative design had been presented to the family. The members agreed and the Counsel and Superintendent concurred that a conference with Mr. Pei would be appropriate. Mr. Walton appointed Mr. Bunshaft and Mr. Roche as members of a subcommittee to meet with Mr. Pei in his office at the earliest, most convenient time, hopefully, Saturday, 22nd of February.

4. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) S.L. 69-35, 1401 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., 13-story office building - Proposed Design, Vlastimil Koubek, architect.

The site of the Willard Hotel which would be replaced by the proposed structure is the northeast corner of the proposed National Square at the terminus of Pennsylvania Avenue. After a discussion of the design in relation to the National Square and Pennsylvania Avenue Plan, the members unanimously approved Mr. Walker's motion that "the Fine Arts Commission has approved a master plan for Pennsylvania Avenue, and that this building, if erected, would violate this master plan and for that reason we vote to refuse our approval of the building."

The Commission's action was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

(2) S.L. 69-38, 515 20th Street, N.W. - Proposed Parking Garage, Pierce, Wolff, Yee and Associates, engineers.

The character of the proposed design contrasted sharply with the surrounding group of academic and buildings of a more monumental character, especially the Red Cross Headquarters. The Commission recommended that the 20th St. elevation be given smaller scale openings and that the south elevation be a solid masonry wall.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the engineers later.

(3) S.L. 69-36, 801-17th St., N.W.- Proposed Office Building. Weihe, Black and Kerr, architects. Elevation drawings and plans were submitted.

The revised design included changes suggested by the Commission. The penthouse had been lowered but its coverage increased which would require a zoning review. No roof plan was submitted. The columns on the principal elevations tapered while the previous plan showed them as straight.

The members thought the design continued to lack quality and should be discussed with the architect later. They would require a roof plan before any final action could be taken.

(4) Appendix 1

The Commission approved the action taken by the staff on Shipstead-Luce Applications listed on Appendix 1. EXHIBIT B

b. Old Georgetown Act

(1) O.G. 69-85, Application for razing frame dwelling at 2505 P St., N.W.

Research on this property revealed that the building was constructed between 1820 and 1865. The members confirmed the Georgetown Board's recommendation that it should not be razed.

The Commission's action was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

Exhibit C

(2) Appendix 2

There were no objections to the actions taken on the Old Georgetown Applications listed on Appendix 2. EXHIBIT C'

5. National Institutes of Health

Incinerator, Tri-Service, Forest Glen Station, Walter Reed Army Medical Center-Revised Design. Metcalf and Eddy, Inc., engineers. (Project was discussed at the end of the meeting with representatives of NIH and the engineers.)

IV. LEGISLATION

1. H.R. 440-1/3/69-Mr. Eilberg-91st Congress

To authorize the Catholic War Veterans to erect a statue of Saint Sebastian in the District of Columbia.

The members unanimously opposed this legislation. Their action was reported to the Committee on House Administration, U.S. House of Representatives. EXHIBIT D

2. Draft Legislation - Bureau of the Budget - 91st Congress

Smithsonian Institution draft bill "To establish a National Armed Forces Historical Museum Park and Study Center."

Similar to previously proposed legislation, the bill included a Dwight D. Eisenhower Center for Research which would become a Presidential Memorial. The members had no objection to establishing a historic museum at Fort Foot and Fort Washington but felt more study was required on the Study Center aspect of the bill before any action could be taken. Copies of the bill will be forwarded to them with action scheduled for the March meeting. ~~EXHIBIT E~~

V. INTERVIEWS

1. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

Proposed Waterfront Development

Mr. Canny and Mr. Sherman of RLA attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Canny reviewed the legislative requirements of the project which were established to honor the rights of businesses displaced by the redevelopment of the Waterfront. Mr. Sherman spoke of the zoning ordinance for parking and building heights, the requirements of the D.C. government in regard to circulation, and the construction of the decks as originally planned. With these requisites the approach was a combination of diversity in the center section and uniformity at the ends. Materials would be similar to those used in Arena Stage and lighting fixtures the same as those planned for other areas of the Waterfront.

Since RLA stated that it was impossible to have one architect design all projects on the waterfront, the members suggested that the Agency commission a design consultant or a coordinating designer who could establish one system wherein "sizes and patterns would vary but give the whole thing unity," as Mr. Bunshaft stated.

After Mr. Canny and Mr. Sherman left the room, the members concluded that the character of the architecture had not been established. They agreed that no approval could be given until the character is determined and clearly depicted for future submissions. The transcripts are submitted for the record.

EXHIBIT F

The Commission's action was reported to the Redevelopment Land Agency.

2. Freer Gallery of Art

Inspection of Proposed Acquisitions

Time did not permit inspection of the proposed acquisitions.

3. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

a. L'Enfant Plaza, East Building

General Quesada, developer, and Mr. Koubek, architect, attended the meeting.

General Quesada spoke briefly of his group's commitment to the D.C. Highway Department which permitted them to construct footings and columns while Ninth Street is being reconstructed on a lower level as part of the freeway system. A deck would be built over the street and serve as such until the building is constructed. Mr. Koubek commented on his design and its relationship to the West Building.

Discrepancies between the model and drawings were questioned by the members. Apparently the model reflected I.M. Pei's original design while the drawings were Mr. Koubek's adaptation of it. If the hotel section of the building was to be identified by the overhang detail the members thought that feature should be emphasized and appear separate from the offices below. The two functions should be clearly delineated. The members felt the design was not "in keeping" with other structures of the plaza. They requested that it be restudied and a model reflecting the revised

design be presented for review.

In reply to General Quesada's question relating to his earlier comment, the members stated that footings and columns could be placed now before the design is approved. After General Quesada and Mr. Koubek left the members felt it necessary to rescind their approval of immediate construction. Since the building is considered the "keystone" of the Plaza complex, as General Quesada stated, the members agreed more time should be given to the final design before any construction is undertaken. The building's proximity to the HUD building is crucial to the design of both and requires a thorough study.

The Commission's action was forwarded to General Quesada (EXHIBIT G). Disapproval of the design was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

b. Southwest Pepco Substation, Cancelled.

c. Fort Lincoln Development

Mr. Keyes, architect, and others attended the meeting.

In a detailed explanation, Mr. Keyes spoke of the Presidential directive which granted the land and established the goals for the project. An economically and racially balanced community was to be developed by a committee formed by several federal agencies and the D.C. Government with Edward Logue as Principal Development Consultant. With his assistance other consultants were selected to plan and design all aspects of the project.

In response to Mr. Roche's question concerning how various phases would be accomplished and what method of control was planned, Mr. Keyes stated that the formation of a development corporation was proposed. The corporation would serve as a design review board and would be responsible to RLA and the D.C. Government.

The Commission was glad to have this explanation (EXHIBIT H) and anticipated reviewing each phase when developed. No action was necessary.

4. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. S.L. 69-38, 515-20th St., N.W.- Proposed Parking Garage

Mr. Brehmer, architect, and Mr. Gewirz, owner, attended the meeting.

Speaking for the members Mrs. Smith stated the Commission was concerned with the "interruption of the street" and a more "clean-cut structure" should be planned. An all concrete structure with the main facade enclosed was recommended to make the design more subdued.

After Mr. Brehmer's defense of his design the members thought their

recommendations should be considered and the design restudied.

Mr. Walton summarized the members views stating that a "masonry wall structure" be considered. The design should "minimize the building."

The Commission's action was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

b. S.L. 69-36, 801 17th St., N.W. - Proposed Office Building

Mr. Weihe, architect, attended.

Again speaking for the members, Mrs. Smith said the penthouse feature was approved but, should the Board of Zoning Appeals reject the lowered height and increased roof coverage, the Commission would have to review the revised design. The members preferred a vertical wall rather than the proposed "tapered" one. A restudy was requested.

The Commission's action was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

5. National Institutes of Health

Incinerator, Tri-Service, Forest Glen Station, Walter Reed Army Medical Center - Revised Design

Mr. Hitchcock, engineer, and representatives of N.I.H. attended the meeting.

Mr. Hitchcock briefly described the design in relation to the site. The members present felt the design had been simplified and "more honest" than the original plan.

After the engineer and representatives of NIH had left the members decided to approve the plan. They suggested that a neutral shade of brick be used and all exposed mechanical equipment painted that shade.

The Commission's action was forwarded to National Institutes of Health.

EXHIBIT I

The meeting adjourned at 3:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



C. H. Atherton
Secretary

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

2/19/69

NO
OG 69-
ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

24 1528-22nd St., NW Revision to sign submitted under SL 69-22.

Church of the Pilgrims

ACTION: App'd. as revised, 1/17/69.

31 515-20th St., NW Brick & concrete parking garage.

B.S. Gewirx, A. Small

ACTION: Ret'd. for simple block model at either 1"-16' or 1"-20' scale, showing bldgs. in relation to surrounding area from E to F St. & from 19th to 20th St., 2/4/69.

32 3131 Adams Mill Rd., NW

Vincent Coletti

Remove exist. front porch roof. Replace wood fl. with new.
Replace exist. 18" X 18" pier w/proper footing & brick, 18" X 18" X 10'. Replace exist. wood rail. No structural change.

ACTION: No obj., 1/24/69.

33 2128 Cathedral Ave., NW

Jas. Clayton Ridgway

New single family dwelling.

ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. Request subm. of landscape plan. Also request sample of brick, 1/24/69.

34 Davenport St. at

Broad Branch Rd., NW

Chas. F. D. Egbert

Single-family dwelling.

ACTION: App'd. Request subm. of material samples, 2/19/69.

Exhibit B

2/19/69

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

SL 69-

Inf.

35 1401 Penna. Ave., NW
1401 Realty Corp.

13-story & 4-cellar off. bldg. of precast concrete.

ACTION: Disap'd. Plans inconsistent with development of Penna. Ave., which provides for an open square that will incl. the site of this proposed bldg., 2/19/69.

Inf.

36 801-17th St., NW
Canfield M. Himes

12-story off. bldg. with 1st fl. commercial space & 3 basem.
levels of parking.

ACTION: Disap'd. Ret'd. for further study of elevations, 2/19/69.

37

L'Enfant Plaza East, SW
L'Enfant Plaza Corp.

Constr. 12-story off. & hotel bldg.

ACTION: Disap'd. Recom. further study of elevations, in particular the top 3 fls., the manner in which they project & the treatment of the piers at the corners of the bldg. Also request model consistent with design shown on drawings for consideration at next meeting, 2/19/69.

38

515-20th St., NW
B. S. Gewirz & Albert Small

Brick & concrete parking garage.

ACTION: Disap'd. Rcm. further study of exterior elevations w/emphasis on achieving a quieter & more neutral design w/greater unity of materials, especially on the south & west elevations. Details of recom'ds. were discussed w/arch. at the Comm's. meeting on 2/19/69, 2/19/69.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

1/15/69

<u>NO</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
<u>SL 69-</u>		
20	1107 Penna. Ave., NW Medco Discount Center ACTION: App'd., 12/9/68.	1 s-f sign, black ltrs.
Inf.		
21	524-22nd St., NW Oliver T. Carr, Inc. ACTION: No obj., provided that all exterior masonry be brick of a uniform color in the red range, 12/17/68.	Install private garage in exist. basem. with driveway leading from street. 4' high ret. wall.
22	1528-22nd St., NW Church of the Pilgrims ACTION: App'd., provided that lettering is dark bronze mounted directly on limestone surface. Request revised sketch, 12/3/68.	One 15 sq-ft sign. Limestone entablature with inset for displaying church name in black metal ltrs. on white enamel back.
25	515-15th St., NW Hotel Washington ACTION: App'd., 1/6/69.	Change from alum. & glass door to wood door at new restaurant entrance.
26	3001 Beech St., NW Theodore L. Heitmuller ACTION: No obj., 1/9/69.	Build 2-car garage. Brick with slate roof.
27	201 F St., NE Wash. Terminal Co. ACTION: No obj., 1/10/69.	Excavate for & install Diesel storage tank (oil) & elec. Marlow pump.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

1/15/69

ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

NO
SL 69-

23 1400-22nd St., NW

Donohoe Constr. Co., Inc.

ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. Request indication on drawing 8 of fl.-to-fl. heights, cornice line height & top of penthouse as measured from grade. Request resubm. of drawings no later than 1/13/69, in order to be considered at meeting on 1/15/69, 1/7/69.

5-story office bldg. w/2-level parking garage, & service station

28 401 L'Enfant Plaza, SW

L'Enfant Plaza Corp.

ACTION: App'd., provided west elevations modified according to recom'ds. agreed upon at 1/15/69 meeting. See attached ltr. dtd. 2/3/69 to Mr. Stanley Sherman, D. C. RIA. Request subm. of revised design for this detail, 1/15/69.

Final working drawings as requested by CFA on SL 69-64.

29 600 New Hamp. Ave., NW

Watergate Improvement Assn.

ACTION: App'd. for general design. Request samples of material be subm'd. before final permit is issued, 1/15/69.

Stage IV. Bldg. 1. Constr. off. bldg. & apt. house to complete Watergate complex as outlined in Article 75 of Zon. resolution. Request samples of material be subm'd. before final permit is issued,

30 1400-22nd St., NW

Donohoe Const. Co., Inc.

ACTION: Disap'd. While the Comm. feels that the general massing of the bldg. is acceptable, the arch'l. character was thought to be dull & banal. The Comm. recom's. further study with emphasis on achieving a more interesting & refined sense of arch'l. design, 1/15/69.

Resubm. per SL 69-23 for 5-story off. bld. with 2-level parking garage & service station.

20 February 1969

Dear Mr. Beemer:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on February 19, gave further consideration to the application for razing the frame dwelling at 2505 P Street, N.W. This was originally forwarded to the Commission under O.G. 69-85 and returned on 15 January 1969 pending further study.

The Commission believes that this building qualifies in every respect under Public Law 808, 81st Congress for preservation as an example of the early architecture of Georgetown in the National Capital.

The Commission is therefore disapproving the application to raze this building.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. John R. Beemer
Permit Branch
D.C. Department of Licenses and Inspections
District Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

Exhibit C

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

2/19/69

<u>NO</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
98	3301 N St., NW Norman Farquhar	Replace N St. entr. porch & steps with bay window. Erect N St. brick fence wall & entr. gate.
ACTION: No obj. to gnrl. design, but suggest further study of entr. gateway, especially the archway, 2/17/69		
100	3420 R St., NW Howard C. & Marie Anderson	Replace wood front porch & steps with brick & concrete.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided exposed wall previously below grade be treated to match rest of facade & that balusters on metal railings be secured directly to the brick & evenly spaced, 2/17/69.		
101	1333 Wisc. Ave., NW German Properties	6' wood stockade fence in rear.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided that structural support of fence is located to the inside of property, 2/17/69.		
102	1335 Wisc. Ave., NW German Properties	6' wood stockade fence in rear.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided that structural support is located to the inside of property, 2/17/69.		
103	1636 Avon Pl., NW Arthur C. Moore	Constr. new row house.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Design lacks suitable residential character, 2/19/69.		
104	2909 M St., NW Theodore Pedas (Rugs)	1 s-f, 16 sq-ft hand-lettered plywood sign.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Sign to be limited to name of business & a single line of block classical lettering, 2/17/69.		

Exhibit C

2/19/69

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (CONTINUED)

PROJECT

ADDRESS AND OWNER

NO
OG 69-

105 2529-2529A P St., NW Resubm. of OG 69-93 to renovate structure into apts., which
Tebbs S. Chichester, Jr. was ret'd. for accurate section.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Design has too many varied elements. Recom. simplification, 2/17/69.

106 3344 M St., NW Replace damaged brick & framing in front. Replace windows &
Rob't. A. Phillips Trust doors. Brick facing to match exist. brick in size & texture &
Rob't. & Sherman Burroughs all brick facing painted same color.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Design of proposed alterations unsuitable, 2/17/69.

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 440

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 3, 1969

Mr. EILBERG introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

A BILL

To authorize the Catholic War Veterans to erect a statue of Saint Sebastian in the District of Columbia.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Catholic War Veterans are authorized to erect a
4 statue of Saint Sebastian, the patron saint of the military,
5 on the public street area, in the northwest quadrant of the
6 District of Columbia, which is formed by the intersection
7 of F Street, North Capitol Street, and Massachusetts Ave-
8 nue, and which is known as Federal Reservation Number 78.

9 SEC. 2. The design and plans for such statue shall be
10 subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior,
11 the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital

1 Planning Commission, and the United States and the District
2 of Columbia shall be put to no expense in the erection
3 thereof.

4 SEC. 3. The authority conferred pursuant to this Act
5 shall lapse unless (1) the erection of such statue is com-
6 menced within five years from the date of enactment of this
7 Act, and (2) prior to its commencement funds are certified
8 available in an amount sufficient, in the judgment of the
9 Secretary of the Interior, to insure completion of the statue.

10 SEC. 4. The maintenance and care of the statue erected
11 under the provisions of this Act shall be the responsibility
12 of the Secretary of the Interior.

A BILL

To authorize the Catholic War Veterans to erect a statue of Saint Sebastian in the District of Columbia.

By Mr. Kilberg

JANUARY 3, 1969

Referred to the Committee on House Administration

We disapproved this because we did not see how it related, and Chloethiel Smith, who really knows quite a bit about it, I think -- maybe you do, I don't -- was quite concerned it would end up with a series of honky tonks.

MR. ROCHE: This is a private developer picking up a small piece of it?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes. And we feel it's important that we know what the whole thing is going to be.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We did not disapprove this, we just didn't take any action on it. I suggest we look at the model over here and then have them in.

(The Commission members withdrew from the conference table to study model. The discussion was off the record.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right, bring them in, Charlie. I know they want to get out. Our program is to listen. We don't have to take any action until later.

MR. ROCHE: How does one determine whether this kind of thing fits into a master plan?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That's your struggle. This is as much of a master plan as there is, unless they bring more material in here.

MR. CANNY: I understand that you have a number of items on your agenda and you'd like to just spend a couple of

Exhibit 7

minutes with a little bit of the background on this waterfront project here.

The map and the models we prepared are in direct response to your request of the last meeting to try to show you how, to the extent possible, certain amount of architectural unit could be achieved through here.

Mr. Sherman of our staff will discuss with you the physical layouts. What I wanted to do was talk with you for just a moment on the administrative background here.

The waterfront has been a major issue in the city of Washington, as you probably know, for about ten years.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We do.

MR. CANNY: We've attempted to obtain development of the waterfront under public offerings two times previously, and each time received no offers because the context of the waterfront development appeared to be economically unfeasible to private developers. We have offered it now a third time, and have received about 14 proposals for redevelopment of different segments of the waterfront, some of them overlapping.

There are really two keys to all this: one is the legislation, two pieces of legislation actually, in which Congress directed us to give a priority in terms of

8

redevelopment of this to businesses that were previously located on the waterfront. There were about 45 of these businesses that ranged in size from 350 square feet to 30,000 square feet, and we're clearly directed by Congress to provide facilities to the extent possible for these businesses before we permit anybody else in.

We are also required to honor these rights as personal rights of the priority holders. They can't sell them, can't go in as minority stockholders in a larger holding company for redevelopment or anything of that nature. It's intended to permit these people to reestablish the business they previously operated on the waterfront before renewal.

The key to making this type of redevelopment feasible we think is construction of the decks which we have previously shown to your Commission, I guess over a year ago. That work will begin within a couple of weeks. The contract for construction of the decks is being awarded today and we think that is really the basic element setting the physical configuration of the waterfront.

With that kind of background, I'd like to turn it over to Mr. Sherman for description of the model and kinds of questions we have now.

Our Board of Directors understands that we are making this presentation but they've not yet made any awards of space or anything of that sort, pending analysis of the economics of the proposals and also making sure this type of scheme we are talking about here meets with your approval.

Thank you.

MR. SHERMAN: Gentlemen, this will probably be easier to see at the model. Before we move over, perhaps I'll describe how we arrived at what you are about to see.

There are three major physical restraints in addition to the ones Mr. Canny discussed. The three are the Urban Renewal Plan itself, which is essentially a zoning ordinance, dealing with parking, building heights, and so on; the requirements of the District Government in respect to circulation. This affects the street widths, sidewalk locations, need for emergency access along the deck, driveways, service areas, ramps, things visible from the model. And third is actual construction itself, the park design, designed by Mr. Sasaki who is missing this morning.

The deck construction, as Mr. Canny described, is a

necessary beginning point because without it, the sites would not be economically feasible for the individual developers. Those are the three things: renewal plan, the requirements of the District, and the actual construction.

I might say with reference to the park design that that has acted, or we hope it will act as a unifying element for the entire waterfront. You will recall Mr. Sasaki also designed Waterfront Park 6, not shown on that model, which has been built, and it's our hope we can have unified treatment the entire length of the waterfront through coordinated parks,

With these major constraints, we saw three possible approaches toward the architectural development: one which we might describe as total uniformity, which is virtually a physical impossibility in view of the need to have identifiable sites for each individual. The second would be the opposite extreme; namely, total diversity, again which is virtually impossible in view of existing conditions of narrowness of the site, rigidity already achieved by existing construction, and so forth. We have therefore out of necessity come up with a third alternative, which is a degree of mixture, some diversity and some uniformity, and it is that we wish to present.

(The Commission members withdrew from the conference table and discussed the model in an off-the-record discussion.)

MR. BUNSHAFT: What are the materials of that building?

MR. SHERMAN: We are told by the architects they have materials similar to those of Arena Stage, brick and a zinc and tin roof.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It's dark?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think myself there ought to be some discipline in that. There is a discipline in that model because it is all painted white. I think there ought to be a discipline of the materials to be used -- not suggested, I mean used; in other words, if this is that brick, it ought to be used throughout the job and I think ideally it would be wonderful if you had one architect, but that's not possible.

MR. SHERMAN: That is not possible.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Because it is an opportunity to get some unity and variety, but there ought to be unity.

What do you think, Kevin?

MR. ROCHE: What about the outdoor lighting?

MR. SHERMAN: As part of the park design, you may not have noticed, we've established a rhythm, precast poles with polyurethane globes which are already used in Park 6, and that rhythm of lighting will carry for the entire waterfront in the public construction.

We would make every effort to assure any outdoor lighting in the way of furniture or fixtures on the part of individual developers who use the same details.

MR. ROCHE: They will provide the outdoor lighting themselves?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, they may have concealed lights in soffitts, for example, which would be merely supplementary to lights which can light the upper and lower walks.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Are these regulations enforceable? You say you will make every effort. Can we really do it?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think there's another thing. I think what Kevin raised on signs, I think there ought to be one graphic designer for the whole job, so that there is a unity, you know. I am not saying he should not be able to define the building, but one should not have purple and Gothic letters and another Chinese letters. It seems to me there should be some effort, when the Government does a big thing like this, not to just have a series of individual

buildings that happen to be there. Materials, lighting, design -- in fact, someone ought to watch the whole thing in detail.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Sasaki is under contract to the agency not only for design of parks but to act as an adviser on received proposals, actual proposals. These are modifications of received proposals, and we would hope he would act in that capacity, though I agree a graphic designer is a helpful suggestion.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It's a small thing and each architect could hire the same fellow as far as the finances. In the end, most of these things -- the signs -- you don't even see the architecture, all you see is signs.

MR. SHERMAN: Would you like to comment, Mr. Canny?

MR. CANNY: I think that is a very good suggestion and we can probably hire a graphic designer ourselves to do an overall scheme.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The signs should be legible and all that, but it would be nice to have landscaping, wall surfaces, lighting, roofs and all that a sort of system common throughout the whole thing, don't you think?

MR. ROCHE: I think instead of setting up standards

that you expect everyone to conform to, if you had a consultant, either an overall design consultant -- I'd like not to see just a graphic designer because there are more problems than just graphics, but if you had someone who could take each problem on its merits and bring life to it, and had good taste on the whole thing.

MR. SHERMAN: Each building will be coming back to the Commission as an individual submission roughly conforming with this model.

Hopefully Mr. Sasaki will see it both at Commission meetings and privately.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You know by tradition he withdraws from the meetings.

MR. SHERMAN: We're not discussing his design in this particular case.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, it's a ticklish little problem.

MR. SHERMAN: Then we'd have to get his opinions apart from here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I was talking about somebody who does get into the furniture of the city, not to get a fellow who does stationery, and also the idea there would be one system; sizes and patterns would vary, but give the whole

thing unity.

MR. ROCHE: This is what you need.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It should have variety.

CHAIPMAN WALTON: Big ones are sometimes very good.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's right; I'm not saying size or anything, but it ought to be designed as a total thing.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I'm sure they have the idea.

MR. CANNY: I am sure we can do that; let me for a moment, if I may, explore the idea of unified materials. The two larges proposals we have are for the Flagship Restaurant which would be located approximately in here (indicating on drawing), approximately 50,000 square feet site, and Hogate's Restaurant right here just across the park (indicating). They are very diverse in design. The Flagship Restaurant is a curtain wall, very rectangular and so on.

MR. SHERMAN: Precast.

MR. CANNY: Curtain wall, curtain glass, all along the waterfront, very much different from Hogate's. We would have problems. I am not quite sure how we can go about getting these different architects to come together on using the same materials.

Do you know of any other cases where it has been

done or any suggestions as to how we can, if not impose complete uniformity, at least get some recognition?

MR. BUNSHAFT: You're talking about a Frank Lloyd Wright building and a Mies building to illustrate a point. Well, is that desirable? It gives you variety but I think myself it is a difficult problem.

MR. ROCHE: Well, if you had someone do the overall creative -- you'd get a great variety because --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Are you talking about architecture now?

MR. ROCHE: The whole feeling of the whole thing would be considerable variety, but it would have -- you'd realize the whole thing had some relationship to itself, public garden, park or waterfront, and it would get rid of the stigma of the individual developer who ignores the guy next door to him. It doesn't seem to me you get the result just by making the materials the same.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Of course you don't, but here is the real issue: each owner has his own architect and just to exaggerate, you have in a sense a folk architect and a disciplined one and that's the thing that will destroy it. The ideal thing would be to have one architect do the whole thing and get tremendous variety through ingenuity.

MR. ROCHE: Or if you had an overall designer who would work with each architect and try to get an overall

effect, which is not what you're going to get unless you have one architect or a designer.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Here's a folk architect business with tepees and another guy with a precast very severe thing.

MR. ROCHE: But why then can't they retain the services of an overall design coordinator?

MR. CANNY: We could probably retain the services, but I am not sure we could impose his recommendations.

MR. ROCHE: You never impose anything. People have to get together and work together, and generate enthusiasm for things.

MR. CANNY: Yes.

MR. ROCHE: This depends on the individual that you get.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, do you think it possible that the architects for this building, Wallace McHarg, and the architects of the Flagship, Perkins & Will, could meet together and perhaps with the assistance of the Commission agree or agree to disagree perhaps, but also agree to find some elements to help to unify the buildings?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It sometimes has happened. I think we had a successful foray into L'Enfant Plaza this way, don't you?

MR. SHERMAN: Well -- partially. Not complete.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Where in L'Enfant Plaza? One fellow copied Pei's building.

MR. SHERMAN: The Forrestal Building.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Sure, and all the light fixtures and paving and everything else. We finally got them together.

MR. SHERMAN: It is not a dissimilar situation.

MR. ROCHE: It seems to me the third person ought not to be the Commission, it ought to be a coordinating designer.

(Mrs. Smith entered the conference room at this point.)

MR. BUNSHAFT: The only thing I can suggest is that Sasaki is on the job, and somehow get through him to get these fellows together. I think myself the issue gets down to what this Commission feels. If it isn't done, it is just going to be a whole school of architecture there.

MR. ROCHE: If it is not done, it's no different from any other haphazard development.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's right. I think we can give you a little help by saying we don't approve it that way, maybe.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, I think the RLA indicates they are interested in our position.

MR. CANNY: I suspect correspondence from you embodying these kinds of recommendations would be a very useful tool for us.

MR. BUNSHAFT: In dealing with the people who are taking the land.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think we're just in one little issue that we're in agreement, the Commission, that just requiring uniform materials is not what we want. We want that clear.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, I think we understand that. It is something sort of more than that. There may be diverse materials and it would turn out to be okay.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we'll write you our letter about our point of view, which you do have for any use you wish to make of it.

MR. CANNY: V ery good. That will be very helpful.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: How you do it, you know, we can't solve.

MR. CANNY; Yes, we're faced not only with a diversity of architects but diversity of owners here who are highly independent as Mrs. Smith knows.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Who want to establish their identity by architecture.

MR. CANNY; That's correct, whether it be a Kentucky fried chicken, which we hopefully will avoid or --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I understand when restaurants are competing, when they're on competing corners they want to look different.

MR. ROCHE: There is considerable history that if you generate enough overall excitement or interest, then it is a place to go and they all benefit from that. There are plenty of examples of that kind of developer.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The San Francisco thing is a good example.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It was done by one architect, and they lease space.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I know, but they do establish identity in those complexes.

MR. CANNY; Do you have any thoughts or comments on the site planning that was represented on that model, particularly on the central deck there, the fairly large element at one end and the small shops and arcades and so on?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do you have anything to say on that, Kevin?

MR. ROCHE: No.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do you have any comments?

MR. BUNSHAFT: No.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you very much.

MR. WALKER: It seems to me, Bill, you asked the most important question of all, which was not completely answered. Everything they said was, "We hope we can do this," "We believe that we can," and so on. What actual authority have they and what do we have to veto?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I suspect it would depend on the way they wrote their contracts, wouldn't you think, Charlie?

MR. ATHERTON On the waterfront? No, things are different. We have much more authority on the waterfront than they think. The law reads we will have the power of approval or disapproval. This includes any building permit which includes any sign for it, so we have complete authority.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Great.

MR. WALKER: That's the second part of my question. The first part is they still can draw up contracts giving themselves the authority to pass on the particular buildings that are being put up, can't they?

MRS. SMITH: They have that, an architectural review board.

MR. WALKER: But everything they talked about today, "We hope we can do this if possible." The point you made, Bill, and what worries me is they are getting out of here quite happy and everything seems fine, but when buildings get put up, they're going to perhaps be an absolute mess of heterogeneous architecture. It looks that way unless you have someone with authority.

MR. ATHERTON: This Commission has the authority.

MR. WALKER: But it's almost too late when it comes here. I think perhaps we should recommend and make almost contingent on what you were proposing, a design coordinator.

MR. ROCHE: Is there anything to show the flavor of this development and how it's going to be not as individual buildings but what it will be when you walk around.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No.

MR. ROCHE: This does not give you detail at all. Shouldn't we ask whoever is going to do that if it's Sasaki, some sense of character of this development, not just individual buildings but character of the development be presented?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It would be very useful.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think what we're saying here is that we are not approving anything. We are still saying that we want to see an organized design. We said we wanted to see a

site plan and they came in with it. Now we are asking for certain -- I don't know the word -- unity, yes, and an overall concept that has something to make it unique, rather than just each fellow alone. That's what we ought to say, and we don't want each one to be alone, spearate.

MR. ATHERTON: There is a matter of scheduling, which presents a problem.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I don't think now, as I understand it more clearly, Charlie, that we are holding up anything as long as they are building this deck thing. They did have to let the contracts start on this, so I understand perfectly, but the superstructures -- we are not holding them up if we delay the superstructures, are we, Charlie? I mean we are if we hold them up indefinitely, but if we delay them one month?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think you're talking about a big project.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I just want to know technically if this is true.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We are beating around the bush because each one of these restaurants is going to fight that, is going to be absolutely opposed to that. This fellow with his folk art is going to want that, it's been sold to a client,

and now -- Sasaki isn't any -- what Kevin is dreaming about, and what ought to have been done is somebody doing an overall design in which these fellows play within. Now you are talking about two complete designs, the architects have all the drawings down for a fee, and now you start talking about starting over.

MR. ATHERTON: They want some direction on this particular preliminary submission. Is this completely out of taste or appropriateness? They'd like to get some idea.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This letter we send has to be very well written, saying that -- you know, he presented three things: one where everybody goes his own way, one where you have one design scheme, and the third, where you have a mixture. I think what we're saying is we don't want any of the three. What we are saying is there ought to be some overall basic elements, such as lighting and so forth, within which each architect can work, that will give, when they're through, a certain sense of as if it were done by one agency.

MR. ATHERTON: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We therefore cannot approve the design of this first one, because it's completely different, as you describe, from the second one -- completely different. I really think to do seriously what ought to be done would

really require quite a bit of knocking of heads together. If you are talking about a Wright and Corbu getting together to build a building -- boy!

MRS. SMITH: Would it be appropriate from the time they made a study, and -- I made a study, and so on -- the idea always was there would be a total study. Now they have totally ignored that and are going to do it in pieces. Isn't it appropriate for them to hire someone to do a total study?

MR. BUNSHAFT: What we were talking about before you came in, inasmuch as Sasaki is on the job, he'd try to get these two architects together.

MRS. SMITH: But before that -- not just getting them together.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It's nice but these fellows probably have a set of working things done. I really don't think you build a platform and build a building on top of it. I think you have to anticipate utilities and all sorts of things. Of course you know those things underneath can't be built as though it were a piece of land. There have to be holes for utilities and stuff coming through from the restaurant above. I think the system is fine but we're about eight months late because these fellows didn't listen to us, and I think the only thing we can do is

write a letter saying we're not satisfied.

MRS. SMITH: They didn't think that the waterfront, they told me some months or years back, had anything to do with the Fine Arts Commission, and they didn't have to submit it is what they said.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The owners of these restaurants may walk out on them. Anyhow, all we can do is write a letter that can explain what we are saying.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, the Commission has agreed we are rejecting this building at the moment. There is one building before us is our problem, and recommending that they hire an overall design consultant.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think you could say the words not approving this design, especially in that they described another project entirely different in character of architecture, and we feel there has to be some sense of -- the word "unity" is dangerous --

MR. ROCHE: They have not sufficiently established the character of the whole project.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think the word to use is "harmony," don't you? You know, unity sounds as though they all have to be alike. Harmony -- they go together.

MR. ROCHE: I don't like "harmony" personally.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: What word would you use?

MR. ROCHE: I'd say what we don't know is we don't know what is the character of this, how interesting, how exciting is it going to be?

MR. BUNSHAFT: We don't know the character of the entire project. That's the word: character.

MR. ROCHE: They have not established that character and these models do not establish it at all.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, of course not.

MR. ROCHE: So they have to do that and the only way they can do it is to hire a good designer who can bring all of these things together, all the various aspects.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It is more than Sasaki. We cannot approve this design until we have seen the character of architecture for the whole project is a simple way of putting it, and we suggest they get a coordinating architect.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Great. We've got it.

In general, we make a great claim of not recommending specific people, so we'll remove that from the record for a minute.

MR. WALKER: Perhaps we might have lunch in the Flagship Restaurant which is right down there, so we can look at the site.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But we'd have to subject ourselves to that awful food, which is just terrible.

MR. WALKER: Is it terrible? I withdraw the suggestion.

MR. BUNSHAFT: If they had an architect to do the design for the whole thing as a preliminary concept, they could have got each of these restaurants in. Now that they each have their own tepee, it is going to be very difficult realistically. We can pursue it anyway.

MR. ROCHE: It is being done on all kinds of different levels all over the country.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Now we have to move along a little bit.

(L'Enfant Plaza, East Building)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is L'Enfant Plaza, East.

MR. ATHERTON: This is the last remaining building in the L'Enfant Plaza Development. This is a general site location which is just north of the site on the waterfront we have just been looking at. Here is the open square (indicating on sketch). This is the Housing and Urban Development Building, Breuer's building. The Commission looked at this building here at the last meeting and approved the design for that. This building (indicating) is under

20 February 1969

1e

Dear General:

After your appearance with Mr. Koubek at our February 19th meeting, the members of the Commission of Fine Arts had further conversations about the design of the Hotel-Office Building proposed for L'Enfant Plaza.

The members were unanimous in a feeling of misgiving about permitting any footings to be constructed at this time lest such construction predetermine a design that might be unsatisfactory. Therefore the Commission voted to deny permission for such construction until detailed designs for the building are submitted along with an updated model on which we can study the delicate relationships with existing buildings.

This does reverse verbal permission for construction that we granted rather hastily. However, all members felt that the architect's presentation had been inadequate for such an important structure and we had spoken too hastily in response to your request for speed. The need for speed is a real one, I know, and the Commission will cooperate in every possible way when proper presentation is given of designs for our consideration.

The Commission considers this building, the last major unit of L'Enfant Plaza, one of the most important in Washington and one that could make or break your magnificent development. Therefore it merits the most careful study and design.

With best wishes always,

Yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Lt. General E. R. Quesada
990 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024

Exhibit G

MR. ATHERTON: Gentlemen, this is Mr. Keyes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good afternoon. How are you?

MR. KEYES: Fine, thank you.

I understand there were some rather basic questions raised about For Lincoln and with your permission, I will start at the very beginning, and say the land was made available by direction from the White House to GSA, having been federal land. Money for planning came through H.U.D. to R.L.A., the Planning Commission.

The committee was formed with the R.L.A. Planning Commission. H.U.D., and the mayor's office being represented, and a principal consultant was selected, El Logue, and then with his assistance the other consultants were selected, they being David Crane, Philadelphia; Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon of Washington on the planning and design aspects; Alan Voorhees, transportation; Volkert on engineering; Gladstone on economic studies. We also had an educational study by Dr. Fantini of the Ford Foundation.

Now the directive was quite specific on two points: one, they wanted a balanced community, economically and racially, and wanted an innovative model community which would serve as an example to other cities which might have surplus federal or city land.

Exhibit H

Now, very early in the game we made a major decision if it were going to be a balanced community racially we would have to change the mix of public housing to the 221-D-3 and typical FHA housing, because of the large families in that lowest category, and we finally came up with only 900 public housing units, 450 of which would be for the elderly and 450 for the large-family demand. This does not begin to answer the needs of the District, and we know that, but we don't think you can solve that housing problem all in one site in one corner of the city.

The other thing was, as far as the innovative aspects of it were concerned, we made an exhaustive study of, among other things, new technologies that might be applied to the construction of the buildings and the utilities on the site.

The program development phase was a process of overlapping and interlocking steps involving inputs from the various consultants to the design and planning team, and we came up -- well, I might say in the process of perfecting that program, we made a careful study of the site in its regional context in terms of its connections with regional transportation and employment centers, and so on; in its community aspects in terms of what facilities were lacking in

adjacent communities which might be served here and what would be the impact of this on the other communities and on the immediate neighborhood covering such matters as impact on the traffic in this locality and the access to it, and any facilities that might be developed which are badly needed in the neighboring area. We made a very careful study of the site from its geological point of view and contours, orientation, vegetation, drainage, and so on, which led us eventually to a pattern of five neighborhoods around a central open space, this being the main drainage area of the site now and these other divisions being secondary drainage patterns (indicating on drawing), which would become pedestrian circulation routes and small parks, and these neighborhoods are linked together. Well, we made a great effort to minimize the amount of automotive traffic around the site and Alan Voorhees made a study of the possibility of a minirail which is a patented name, I think.

We came up finally with a system called a Dashavair (phonetic), which would be a year-round enclosed system fully automatied but the minirail has the advantage of reducing the amount of movement on the site in cars, and actually that then reduces the number of families with second cars and reduces the amount of parking and that raises our density.

We had quite a struggle with density because the initial programs mentioned 25,000 families.

When we got through with the full program of non-residential and educational facilities, rights-of-way, open land, and so on, we had actually about 120 acres of residential use, and we also set ourselves various stringent housing design criteria, principally that any family with children would have direct access to their home, not being required to go through public hallways or elevators and stairs. This limited the amount of high-rise we might have, actually about 30 percent of the units, and it of course limited the density overall, and we eventually ended up with about 38 families per net residential acre, and that compares with standards that are used by the London County Council, for example, compares closely with them.

It's not a downtown and not suburban density, and when you say that, 38 families per net residential acre, you are automatically saying some other things, too, about their parking. We have to structure quite a bit of the parking, about half of it will be under cover and we originally had even more, but we ran into some economic problems there.

The educational system was a choice, really,

between the typical dispersed pattern of facilities prevalent today or the educational park approach all in one place, or a combination of those where there would be some movement of the students in the upper grades, high school and college level, to specialized learning centers, and there would be some benefit from the interchange in the groups, the age groups, and the concentration of facilities such as performing arts in one place.

Another of course major item was the basic disposition of the non-residential facilities, and that might have been all in one center, and may have been dispersed more or less equally for each neighborhood or it might be just a major center and a minor, and it was this latter course that we chose that might compare to, say, a shopping center at Wisconsin and Western Avenue, and another at Chevy Chase Circle; that's just about the distance between these two.

Our original plan called for the minor center which was going to emphasize some of the special learning activities and the institutional and cultural activities up on top of the hill, and the major employment center, commercial center combined with the Federal City College down here on New York Avenue, because of its more easy access to other parts of the city. We had a plan which we called Plan A, and that maximized every possibility in innovation we felt that we could

justify, and then we had another plan, Plan B, which we unfortunately called the "Business as Usual" Plan and it simply did without the special educational system, without the minirail, without the structured parking, and a number of other things, just to show the consequences of taking the usual route.

After that preliminary planning, Plan A was reviewed by the Planning Commission and R.L.A. They came back with the suggestion that the major employment and commercial activity be in the town center up here (indicating), while still retaining the auditorium and specialized learning center, some business administration, and creative arts activities; but that the rest of the college would be down here (indicating) and would relate to a secondary commercial center and to the development of the waterfront along the Anacostia and that Plan C has now been presented to the Planning Commission for approval.

That is where we stand at the moment.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is Plan C?

MR. KEYES: And this is Plan C. Now I see we have a lot of people here who have gone through this with me in the last year. It is a very quick review.

I brushed by the problem of the density of housing.

We designed a series of prototype housing units, ranging in density all the way from about ten families per acre which we call the atrium house, on up through various types of town houses, terrace houses, and deck houses which get up to 45 per acre, and then jump to the high-rise limited by our zoning regulations, and have about 90 families per acre.

Well, with this mix we tested the site. We're not saying these are exactly the units that are going to be used, by any means, but they are all types which meet the severe housing criteria we set for ourselves.

There are no garden apartments, for example, which is very common here today.

This area (indicating) was not studied in great detail. I know there is something I left out, too, which is realignment of New York Avenue and the extension of Eastern Avenue, but because of that, this area and because of the fact that the Federal City College program is not very settled, this area is not studied in much detail.

This one (indicating) we studied in terms again of seeing whether we could get the requirements on a very limited site, when these facilities that were here were moved up.

Mostly there was a half-mile square feet of an office complex for a Federal agency, which brought a requirement for a great many cars. Then the major commercial brought some more, so we actually had a requirement for about 1200 cars. This site is the hilltop and falls off quite steeply. Some of the grades are 20 percent. There is only one thing we could do, and that is put the whole thing over an underground garage. There are four levels to that. The lowest level is approached from this site which is South Dakota Avenue, then branch up through and out on this side to join with Eastern Avenue extended. Traffic could flow either way, but you peel off at the level you want to. It is not intended as a major through route for the site. In fact, we went out of our way, as I said, to minimize the automobile movement and we have this loop road. This is the main function of the extension of Eastern Avenue, at least at the present time, as far as we're concerned, that it provides access to the various service roads into the project and comes back here on this side of the Federal City College (indicating) and in and around the project and out on South Dakota.

New York Avenue now swings up in a loop here, and then back down and crosses the Pennsylvania Railroad track,

leaving 17 acres isolated from the rest of the site. In view of the fact that Federal City College was to be given 20 acres and the difficulty in getting all these requirements on the site, we felt it justified realignment of New York Avenue and reclaiming that land as part of the community. The Highway Department has a major reconstruction in mind for the bridge over Pennsylvania, and now with a new routing for I 95 access, it will be widened besides, so they were amenable to doing New York Avenue over from the point when it gets on the District side of the Anacostia. Eastern Avenue eventually can be extended to join again with Eastern Avenue on the other side of the river, the Anacostia. We think this is very useful because of the community facilities available here, particularly the Federal City College, but also the employment center, entertainment, so on. This area, Anacostia, is one that has been rather isolated as a neighborhood, a community in the city.

There are some drawings around here. Over there against the wall are some town center studies that certainly show how the red commercial and the blue, the educational yellow, the garage and minirail stops might be arranged to create a plaza. There would be a theater plaza, a gallery with shops, two-story gallery of shops joining those two.

Then another sort of overlook plaza looking down through the open space of the site where we would have a water course and that more passive area is more directly related to the educational facilities.

All of these designs, as you see in the perspectives, are at this point suggestions. They may be quite different by the time we come back again.

There are some aspects of this which I think are of concern to the Fine Arts Commission, one being the fact that the educational program calls for an integration of some of the school facilities into other nonresidential buildings, as well as high-rise residential. The early child care, child are and early learning centers, were proposed by the consultants to be a more integral part of the residential community, and this brings up many problems, but I think one being since they are then federal or city buildings, they come before the Commission perhaps under a different authority than the residential.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. KEYES: This is a problem. I didn't mention the development of Anacostia too much. You see the property line. There are seven acres between the railroad tracks and riverfront, which is still part of Fort Lincoln. There happens to be a little knoll rising up out of a lot of

marshland. At that point we hoped to make a pedestrian and minirail connection to this part of the site. Beyond that, beyond those seven acres of course we don't have jurisdiction but we have talked with the Park Department and they are developing a plan for Anacostia and although the major activity is down river, they still have proposed a marina, possibly a restaurant, and recreational facilities here without getting too commercial.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, the river is actually about knee-deep or ankle-deep, isn't it?

MR. KEYES: There are small boats that do go up and down here. The low bridge here prevents any sailboats from continuing beyond. There is a marina up here, just power boats, on the Maryland side.

There is some sort of minor boating, canoeing and rowboats, I think, which might be very useful because right across here is the Aquatic Gardens, and it might be a kind of nice way to get over there. Incidentally, too, the mini-rail would be linked with a rapid transit stop. We had proposed originally it come down from this point on the river (indicating) go around the edge of the Arboretum, and down to the Anacostia Park area, the Kingman Lake area, and then on to the transit stop here near the stadium. We have had

objections from the Park Department on that score, and an alternative route is now suggested which would join up with one of the transit stops on this side of the 'nacostia, which might have some advantages, actually, although it does not bring the people nearer to the heart of town; it makes a much better connection between this rather isolated community and new Fort Lincoln.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Which entrances do you consider the principal ones? I mean to the whole project. It has a slightly closed-in look to me,

MR. KEYES: Yes, it does. We have along the northeast boundary this large tract which is a cemetery (indicating on model.) Beyond that, a tract which is to be turned into a public golf course. Over here we have a little bit of industrial and some residential, and then a great tract of the Arboretum, and here the river, so it's a kind of appendix that hangs down here and is not closely knit into the residential activity of the rest of Northeast Washington.

As you say, it does perhaps seem a bit closed in but there is no way to --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Nothing to blend with, but I meant really actual entrances.

MR. KEYES: The main automobile access slips

around New York Avenue, and this is of course one of the major ones out of town. The main bus access would be here at a stop at Bladensburg Road and we propose a pedestrian overpass at that point, too. There are a couple of accesses on South Dakota that would take you into the project, and of course with Eastern Avenue extended up here at Bladensburg Road, you could come in from this side and move around and get into the northern half of the project.

MR. ROCHE: In the development of this, how then do you actually accomplish these various parts? Who will build them, who will design them, how will you control them? How do you reach your goal?

MR. KEYES: Well, that brings us to this next -- one of our other major innovations and that is we have proposed this be accomplished by the formation of a development corporation similar to the technique used in England. This corporation would be responsible to the R.L.A. and to the city, but it would be quasi-independent and would be responsible for the coordination and design of the entire project.

We think it has been proven that the traditional way of going about urban renewal is a very slow and awkward one, and to break this up into a lot of separate parcels more or less unrelated is going to take, as it did in

Southwest and other places, ten years to do.

The development corporation could parcel out the land but it would first undertake some studies, further studies in possible building technologies which might be adapted to the whole site, and one of the things that study proved is that most of the systems used in Europe effectively and I think any system which could be proven to be useful economically would have to deal with terms of a couple thousand units. You might get two systems in competition. When I say systems, methodology of building, in competition at this site, but I think area 1 which was experimental in this respect ran into this problem head-on, that a couple hundred units of this and that just wasn't enough to get the economies desired or to prove the point as far as any new approaches to building are concerned.

MR. ROCHE: How much of the visualization we've seen is intended as such and how much is simply a referral, illustrating a use plan?

MR. KEYES: Well, the plan has been transmitted into urban renewal documents. They are not here but there are a number of required drawings as well as the text that goes with official urban renewal plans which has been drafted and submitted to R.L.A. I think this will be revised, is

being revised, but it will be that plan which goes finally to the D.C. Council for approval and becomes the skeleton on which all this is to be built, and it does follow this in considerable detail.

I would say the planning is fairly complete. I think the design necessarily with the amount of time and the budget available is more in the nature of a suggestion.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mrs. Smith, do you have any questions?

MRS. SMITH: Well, we had lots of questions but it's almost impossible to spend a half-hour and do it. I think it goes through so many stages. This is more in the nature of an explanation to us.

MR. KEYES: Well, I thought with so little time, all we could do was sort of brush over it and if there is a particular aspect you want to dwell upon, we could do that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we're looking on it as an educational tour, and we expect to study it ourselves, too, and we certainly will reserve any comment. We are not going to make any but it's an opportunity to ask any questions any member wants to ask.

MR. KEYES: I think that this business about the development corporation has to be settled before some of your

questions can be answered.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, of course.

MR. KEYES: Because that corporation would have some form of design review board and esthetic control which you might be part of.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, exactly. Well, if there are no other questions, thank you very much for this enlightenment.

MR. KEYES: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We'll study it and be with you a long time we hope.

MR. KEYES: We expect so.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good; thank you.

(Proposed Parking Garage, 20th St. N.W.)

MR. ATHERTON: We have the architect, Mr. Brehmer, who is the architect on this.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good. We have just a couple of simple questions or comments. We have asked Mrs. Smith to be our spokesman on this.

MRS. SMITH I think our interest is the relation of 20th Street to the E Street development, because it interrupts what will gradually become an important, almost institutional area, and we are concerned about its interruption

20 February 1969

Dear Mr. DeWitt:

This is to confirm the Commission's approval of the revised designs for the Tri-Service Incinerator, which we viewed at our meeting on February 19th.

In order to further simplify the building we urge that a neutral shade of brick be used and that all the exposed mechanical equipment be painted to match the building as closely as possible.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. William B. DeWitt
Acting Director
Division of Research Services
National Institutes of Health
Bethesda, Md. 20014

Exhibit I

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
19 February 1969

AM
10:00

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting: Executive and Open Sessions--
19 March, 10:00 a.m.
2. Approval of Minutes of January 1969 meeting

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

- a. Proposed Waterfront Development, Maine Avenue, S.W.
- b. L'Enfant Plaza, East Building - Proposed Design,
10th Street, S.W.
- c. Southwest Pepco Substation - Proposed Design,
Virginia Avenue, S.W.
- d. Fort Lincoln Development, Washington-Baltimore Parkway

2. I.M. Pei and Associates

Robert F. Kennedy Grave Site, Arlington, Virginia-
Revised Design

3. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

- (1) S.L. 69-35, 1401 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.,
13 story office building - Proposed design
- (2) S.L. 69-38, 515 20th Street, N.W. -
Proposed Parking Garage
- (3) S.L. 69-36, 801 17th Street, N.W. - Proposed
Office Building
- (4) Appendix 1

b. Old Georgetown Act

- (1) OG 69-85, Application for razing frame dwelling
at 2505 P Street, N.W.
- (2) Appendix 2

4 National Institutes of Health

Incinerator, Tri-Service, Forest Glen Station, Walter Reed
Army Medical Center - Revised Design

IV. LEGISLATION

1. H.R. 440-1/3/69-Mr. Eilberg-91st Congress

To authorize the Catholic War Veterans to erect a statue of
Saint Sebastian in the District of Columbia.

2. Draft Legislation-Bureau of the Budget-91st Congress

Smithsonian Institution draft bill "To establish a National
Armed Forces Historical Museum Park and Study Center."

V. INTERVIEWS

- 10:30 1. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

Proposed Waterfront Development

2. Freer Gallery of Art

Inspection of Proposed Acquisitions

12:30 LUNCH

- 2:00 3. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

a. L'Enfant Plaza, East Building

b. Southwest Pepco Substation

2:30 c. Fort Lincoln Development

- 3:00 4. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. S.L. 69-38, 515 20th St., N.W. - Proposed Parking Garage

b. S.L. 69-36, 801 17th St., N.W. - Proposed Office Building

- 3:30 5. National Institutes of Health

Incinerator, Tri-Service, Forest Glen Station, Walter Reed Army
Medical Center - Revised Design

